

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 10-14 are pending in the application.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hager et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,247,661) in view of Shakib et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,787,262).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hager et al. in view of Shakib et al., and further in view of Domen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,504,676).

Claims 10, 11 and 12 are amended, and, thus, claims 10-14 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS

In the Office Action, all the claims 10 to 14 are rejected based on the same references cited in the previous office action. That is, claims 10, 11, 13, and 14 are rejected as being obvious over the combination of Hager and Shakib, and claim 12 over the combination of Hager, Shakib, and Domen. Claim 11 is rejected as being indefinite.

Claim 10 is amended for clarity. According to claim 10 as previously presented, in contrast to the relied upon references, the "processing unit" 11 of the "electronic multimedia object management apparatus," provides:

according to a predetermined cycle, for each electronic multimedia object stored in the storage unit,

reads the attribute information in the corresponding distribution target management table stored in the storage unit, and ***reads the master attribute information in the master tables stored in the master server through the communication unit,***

compares the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name of the read attribute information of the distribution target management table with the master corporate organization code and the master corporate organization name of the read master attribute

information,

retrieves from the enterprise department server corresponding to the master corporate organization code of the read master attribute information, through the communication unit, the job information defining the job of the at least one corporate organization stored in the enterprise department server, if it is determined that at least one of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name of the read attribute information of the distribution target management table coincides with at least one of the master corporate organization code and the master corporate organization name of the read master attribute information,

determines whether the job defined by the job information retrieved coincides with the job to which the electronic multimedia object relates, and

rewrites the attribute information in the corresponding distribution target management table, if determined that the attribute information of the distribution target management table does not coincide with the master attribute information and that the job information retrieved coincides with the job to which the electronic multimedia object relates" (e.g., independent claim 10, emphasis added).

As suggested by the Office Action, Response to Arguments, the rejection rationale of independent claims 10, 13, 14, relies on Shakib's discussion of comparing the received properties to local properties to check the conflict between the received and local properties of the distributed data objects (page 7 and page 10, item 15 of the Office Action). However, according to Shakib, the local server rewrites the local data by newly receiving data from another server first and then comparing the received data with the local data. Therefore, according to Shakib, the local server is required to receive the data including data that may be or become unnecessary (Shakib, column 4, line 34 to column 5, line 44). On the contrary, according to the claimed present invention, to rewrite the distribution target management table, the processing unit of the electronic multimedia object management apparatus accesses the master server and the enterprise department server via the communication unit to carry out the comparison, determination, retrieval, and rewriting as recited in the independent claims 10, 13 and 14 (see the emphasized claim recitations above and "**according to a predetermined cycle, for each electronic multimedia object** stored in the storage unit, **reads** the attribute information in the corresponding distribution target management table stored in the storage unit, and **reads the**

master attribute information in the master tables stored in the master server through the communication unit e.g., claim 10). As a result, the claimed present invention provides a benefit that there is no need to transmit and receive any large-size data, and only necessary portions of the distribution target management table can be rewritten. Shakib teaches away from the claimed present invention in column 5, lines 40-44, by discussing, "a primary object of this invention to provide systems and methods for distributed conflict resolution among replica objects replicated across a computer network which do not require the use of a central conflict resolution location."

More particularly, as the Office Action acknowledges in page 6, Hager does not disclose the claimed present invention's, "**reads** the attribute information in the corresponding distribution target management table stored in the storage unit, and **reads the master attribute information in the master tables stored in the master server through the communication unit ... retrieves from the enterprise department server corresponding to the master corporate organization code of the read master attribute information, through the communication unit, the job information defining the job of the at least one corporate organization stored in the enterprise department server, if it is determined that at least one of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name of the read attribute information of the distribution target management table coincides with at least one of the master corporate organization code and the master corporate organization name of the read master attribute information.**" Further, contrary to the Office Action suggestion in page 5, although Hager discusses in column 2, lines 30-38, "an examination of the department number, division, building, laboratory group, et cetera associated with the creator or creators of the document," Hager still fails to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention's, "electronic multimedia object management apparatus" that is in communication with "a plurality of **enterprise department servers** and a **master server**, each enterprise department server managing at least **one corporate organization and storing job information defining a job of the at least one corporate organization**, the master server storing a plurality of master tables corresponding to the enterprise department servers, each master table including master attribute information comprising at least a master corporate organization code and a master corporate organization name of the at least one corporate organization managed by the corresponding enterprise department server."

So the Office Action relies on Shakib, but Shakib discusses a local server keeping track of locally made changes and broadcasting the locally made changes to all other servers, allowing each server to update the local replica as changes are received by replacing the older data objects with the newer data object (column 4, lines 34-45). However, Shakib in column 5, lines 40-44 teaches away from the claimed present invention provides, “**according to a predetermined cycle, for each electronic multimedia object stored in the storage unit, reads the attribute information in the corresponding distribution target management table stored in the storage unit, and reads the master attribute information in the master tables stored in the master server through the communication unit**” (e.g., claim 10). Therefore, it is readily apparent that a combination of Hager and Shakib would not achieve the claimed present invention, because, first, Hager does not disclose or suggest use of the claimed present invention’s, “a plurality of **enterprise department servers** and a **master server**.” Second, Shakib fails to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention’s, “**according to a predetermined cycle, for each electronic multimedia object stored in the storage unit, reads the attribute information in the corresponding distribution target management table stored in the storage unit, and reads the master attribute information in the master tables stored in the master server through the communication unit, ... retrieves from the enterprise department server corresponding to the master corporate organization code of the read master attribute information, through the communication unit, the job information defining the job of the at least one corporate organization stored in the enterprise department server, if it is determined that at least one of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name of the read attribute information of the distribution target management table coincides with at least one of the master corporate organization code and the master corporate organization name of the read master attribute information,**” because in Shakib a local server receives changes from other servers.

Accordingly, Shakib fails to support a motivation or suggestion to be combined with Hager, because Shakib’s updating and conflict resolution differs from the claimed present invention. Furthermore, Shakib also fails to disclose or suggest anything about modifying Hager to provide the claimed present invention’s, “a plurality of **enterprise department servers** and a **master server**, each enterprise department server managing at least **one corporate organization and storing job information defining a job of the at least one corporate**

organization, the master server storing a plurality of master tables corresponding to the enterprise department servers, each master table including master attribute information comprising at least a master corporate organization code and a master corporate organization name of the at least one corporate organization managed by the corresponding enterprise department server.”

Support for the independent claims 10, 13 and 14 can be found, for example, on page 9, line 21 to page 10, line 21; page 11, line 1 to page 16, line 11; and FIGS. 3, 4, and 5, of the present Application.

Regarding the rejection of claim 11 being indefinite, claim 11 is amended, taking into consideration the Examiner's comments. In contrast to Hager and Shakib, the claimed present invention as recited in dependent claim 11 provides,

11. (Currently Amended) The electronic multimedia object management apparatus according to claim 10, ~~further comprising wherein the processing unit rewrites the corresponding distribution target management table of the electronic multimedia object by~~

....

replacing one of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name of the attribute information included in the read distribution target management table, which does not coincide with one of the master corporate organization code and the master corporate organization name of the read master attribute information stored in the memory unit, with the one of the master corporate organization code and the master corporate organization name of the read master attribute information stored in the memory unit, such that the read attribute information in the read distribution target management table of the electronic multimedia object coincides with the master attribute information.

Further, dependent claim 12 is amended for clarity, and in contrast to Hager, Shakib and Domen, the claimed present invention as recited in dependent claim 12 provides,

12. (Currently Amended) The electronic multimedia object management apparatus according to claim 11, ~~40~~, further comprising an electronic mail outputting unit ~~which outputs, if any of attribute information in the distribution target management tables is rewritten,~~ **that confirms whether the replacing by the processing unit to rewrite the attribute information of the distribution target management table is correct by automatically outputting an electronic mail to a corporate organization identified by one of the master corporate organization code and the master corporate organization name which is to replace one of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name of the attribute information of the distribution target management table, wherein**

the processing unit performs the replacing if a reply which confirms that the replacement is correct is received from the corporate organization within a predetermined time period from a time the electronic mail is output by the electronic mail outputting unit notifying a change in the attribute information to each corporate organization identified by the attribute information included in the rewritten distribution management table (emphasis added).

Support for the amendments to dependent claim 12 can be found, for example, in page 16, lines 12-23 of the present Application. The Office Action in page 10, relies on Domen, column 2, lines 31-34, which discusses “the prepared form may be transmitted to other work station by an electronic mail.” However, Domen fails to disclose or suggest confirmation of a correct update to a distribution target management table of an electronic multimedia object in a corporate organization via email, as recited in dependent claim 12. Shakib and Domen, which is relied upon primarily to reject dependent claim 12, fail to disclose or suggest the claimed present invention’s, **“confirms whether the replacing by the processing unit to rewrite the attribute information of the distribution target management table is correct by automatically outputting an electronic mail to a corporate organization ... performs the replacing if a reply which confirms that the replacement is correct is received from the corporate organization within a predetermined time period from a time the electronic mail is output by the electronic mail outputting unit.”** At least dependent claim 12 is allowable over Hager, Shakib and Domen.

In view of the claim amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejections of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 6, 2005

By: 
Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501